

THE HONORABLE JOHN C. COUGHENOUR

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

CORTEZ DAUNDRE JONES,

Plaintiff,

v.

SUNDAR PICHAI, *et al.*,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C23-1218-JCC

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

Pro se Plaintiff, Cortez Daundre Jones, filed a complaint against Sundar Pichai, *et al.*, alleging “440 – Google refuse not to pay Google AdSense to content ID owner” and seeking “two hundred million trillion dollars” in damages. (Dkt. No. 1-1.)

Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e), the Court must dismiss IFP complaints if “at any time” it is determined the complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2); *see also id.* § 1915A(b)(1); *Lopez v. Smith*, 203 F.3d 1122, 1127 (9th Cir. 2000) (Section 1915(e) applies to all IFP proceedings, not just those filed by prisoners).

The Court has reviewed Plaintiff’s complaint and DISMISSES it for two reasons. First, Plaintiff indicates the basis for this Court’s jurisdiction as federal question, but fails to list any specific federal statutes, federal treaties, or provisions of the United States Constitution that are at issue in this case. Second, the complaint includes no factual allegations other than a handwritten statement at the top of the complaint (“The Google robbery via YouTube content ID

1 money with Sundar Pichai vs Distrokid Cortez Daundre Jones”) and an overly vague statement
2 of claim (“Google has Cortez Jones as YouTube content ID owner & the money was paid to
3 someone else – all money acquired belongs to Cortez Jones”). (Dkt. No. 1-1.) These allegations
4 do not set forth sufficient factual matter to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.
5 *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 664 (2009). Labels and conclusions, lacking factual
6 enhancement are insufficient. *Id.* The factual allegations must be “enough to raise a right to relief
7 above the speculative level.” *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007).

8 For the foregoing reasons, the complaint is DISMISSED without prejudice. This
9 dismissal renders consideration of IFP status moot.

10
11 DATED this 31st day of August 2023.

12
13
14 

15 John C. Coughenour
16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26